

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

•				
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,025	11/03/2003	Stephen Bennett Elliott		2143
7590 10/18/2006			EXAMINER	
Stephen Bennett Elliott 702 Buffalo Springs Drive			BOCKELMAN, MARK	
Allen, TX 75013			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3766	
			DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		SX
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
-	10/699,025	ELLIOTT, STEPHEN BENNETT
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark W. Bockelman	3766
The MAILING DATE of this communical Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAII - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communi - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- cation. bry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT by statute, cause the application to become AB.	CATION. The ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 07 August 2006	
	☐ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for		ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice	·	•
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,5,7,9,11-15,17-20,22,24 a</u>	nd 26-45 is/are pending in the apr	alication
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are		meation.
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	wandrawn nom consideration.	
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.		·
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•
8) Claim(s) <u>1,3,5,7,9,11-15,17-20, 22,24,</u>	26-45 are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.
Application Papers		·
9) The specification is objected to by the E	ivaminar	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a		w the Everniner
Applicant may not request that any objection		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	-	• •
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority do		oplication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of t		
application from the International	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed Office action for	or a list of the certified copies not r	eceived.
Attachment(s)	_	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-	4) Interview St.	ımmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		formal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

The examiner notes that claims 1-25 as filed by applicant improperly mix method and system statutory classes of invention. The examiner requires the following restriction based upon the best understanding of the claims. The examiner encourages applicant to amend the claims in his response to place them in correct form for prosecution on the merits

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1,3,5,7,9,11-15,17-20, 22 and 24, drawn to a method of monitoring heart rate, classified in class 128, subclass 898.
- II. Claims 30-45, drawn to a system for detecting heart rate, classified in class 600, subclass 515.
- III. Claims 26-29, drawn to a method of providing feedback including EEGs, classified in class 600, subclass 545.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Invention II as compared to I and III are related as product and process of use.

The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the

Application/Control Number: 10/699,025

Art Unit: 3766

process does not require an eeg monitor or a a pulse sensor. The method could be performed with an ecg sensor and does not require automated detection.

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as as being performed without an eeg. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions

Art Unit: 3766

unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark W. Bockelman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4941. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00 to 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272 -6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MWB

October 15, 2006

MulBell PRIMARY EXAMINER